# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appl. No.: 10/058,212

Applicant: LAMBERT, Robert J.

Filed: January 29, 2002

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PERFORMING FINITE FIELD

**CALCULATIONS** 

Art Unit: 2131

Examiner: ABRISHAMKAR, Kaveh

Docket No.: 67539/00422

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

#### RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

This is further to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated April 25, 2007. Applicant advises that an Amended Brief on Appeal is being submitted concurrently herewith.

# **REMARKS**

As requested in the above-identified Notification, the "Issues" and "Grouping of Claims" sections have been removed and the other headings have been amended to read as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c) including the appendices. As such, the Amended Brief on Appeal is believed to be in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37(c).

The "Summary of Claimed Subject Matter" was objected to as the Examiner believes it does not "map the independent claims on appeal to the specification by page, and line number and to the drawings if any." Although the Applicant believes that this section did in fact originally include numerous references to the specification, drawings and reference numerals, further reference information has been added as reflected in the Amended Brief on Appeal submitted herewith. Accordingly, the Amended Brief on Appeal is believed to be in compliance with 37

Application No. 10/058,212 Reply to Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief of: April 25, 2007

CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v).

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Amended Brief on Appeal complies with the provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.

Respectfully submitted,

Brett U/Slaney

Agent for Applicant Registration No. 58,772

Date: May 9, 2007

BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP Suite 2800, P.O. Box 25 199 Bay Street, Commerce Court West Toronto, Ontario M5L 1A9 CANADA

Tel: 416-863-2518

BSL/

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appl. No.: 10/058,212

Applicant: LAMBERT, Robert J.

Filed: January 29, 2002

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PERFORMING FINITE FIELD

CALCULATIONS

Art Unit: 2131

Examiner: ABRISHAMKAR, Kaveh

Docket No.: 67539/00422

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

#### AMENDED BRIEF ON APPEAL

This Amended Brief on Appeal is submitted in response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated April 25, 2007. Appellant advises that a response to said Notification is being filed concurrently herewith.

This is an appeal of the Final Office Action of the Examiner dated May 26, 2006. A Notice of Appeal from the Primary Examiner to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences was timely filed with the Office on October 26, 2006, along with a request for a two-month extension of time.

#### **REAL PARTY IN INTEREST:**

The real party in interest in the present application is Certicom Corp. The assignment from the Applicant to Certicom Corp. was registered with the office on reel/frame 012840/0504

#### RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES:

There are no related appeals or interferences known to the Appellant, Appellant's representative or assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

## **STATUS OF CLAIMS:**

In this application, claims 1 and 3-11 are pending, and claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 3-11 have been finally rejected and are part of the pending appeal. Please refer to the Claims Appendix for a complete listing of the claims involved in this appeal.

#### STATUS OF AMENDMENTS:

In the response filed by the Applicant on March 16, 2006, claim 1 was amended to recite that upon completion of the computation performed on the machine words, a modular reduction is performed to reduce the result to a predetermined number of words. Claim 2 was cancelled, claims 4 and 6 were amended similar to claim 1, and new claims 7-11 were added.

The above-noted amendments were entered by the Examiner, as indicated in the Final Rejection dated May 26, 2006.

A response was filed by the Applicant on August 28, 2006, however, no further amendments were made.

An advisory action was mailed on September 14, 2006 and a Notice of Appeal filed on October 26, 2006. No further amendments were made.

## **SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER:**

The claimed invention relates, in general terms, to finite field operations (e.g. see page 1,

lines 8-9 and Fig. 8) and to methods for operating on elements in a finite field (e.g. see page 9, lines 19-24 and elements 103 and 113 shown in Fig. 2).

It has been recognized by the Applicant that by not reducing fully as was previously done, but rather to reduce the <u>result</u> of the computation to a <u>predetermined number of words</u>, effort can be saved and randomness can be added to the representation since, e.g., there are then many ways to write the value, when not completely reduced (see page 12, lines 22-26).

In one aspect, a finite field multiplier (e.g. see page 10, lines 20-29 regarding engine 400 having FF multiplication operator 434 as shown in Fig. 5) is provided that is operable to multiply two elements of one of a plurality of finite fields (e.g. see page 9, lines 19-24 and elements 103, 113 in Figure 2), where the finite fields are partitioned into subsets. The multiplier comprises a plurality of word sized finite field multipliers (e.g. see page 12, line 27 to page 13, line 5 regarding elements w0 to wn shown in Fig. 10), where each is suitable for multiplying elements of each finite field in a respective subset of the plurality of finite fields. The multiplier also comprises a finite field reducer (e.g. see page 12, lines 17-26 regarding finite field reduction element 450 shown in Fig. 5), which is configured to perform reduction in the finite field. The multiplier also comprises a processor (e.g. see processor 14, Fig. 1 and discussed on page 9, lines 7-18). The processor (14) is configured to operate the finite field multiplier particular to the finite field to be operated on, to obtain an intermediate product (e.g. stored in registers w2 and w3, see Fig. 13 and page 14, lines 23-28). The processor (14) is also configured to operate the finite field reducer (450) on the intermediate product to obtain the product of the two elements (e.g. see step 1410 in Fig 14 and page 14, line 29 to page 15, line 5) reduced to a predetermined number of words.

In another aspect, a method for adding elements of a finite field  $F_{2^m}$  is provided (e.g. see Fig. 12 and page 14, lines 3-11), where m is less than a predetermined number n. The method comprises storing a first element and a second element (page 14, lines 4-5) in a pair of registers (e.g. see steps 1202 and 1204 in Figure 12 and page 14, lines 3-11), where each of the registers comprises the predetermined number n of machine words. An accumulator (e.g. element w2 shown in Fig. 11, see also page 14, lines 23-28) is established, having the predetermined number n of machine words, and for each of the machine words in the accumulator (w2), the exclusive-or of the corresponding machine words representing the first and second elements is computed (e.g. steps 1206-1216 discussed on page 14, lines 7-11 and in Figure 12) to obtain a representation of

a result of adding the two elements. Upon completion of the computation, a modular reduction is then performed to reduce the result to a predetermined number of words (e.g. see page 12, lines 20-26).

In yet another aspect, a method of performing a finite field operation on at least one element r and a finite field engine for the same are provided, which also comprise reducing the result to a predetermined number of words (see e.g. page 10, lines 20-29 regarding finite field engine 400).

In yet another aspect, a cryptographic system is provided that is configured for performing the methods described above (see page 9, line 7 to page 11, line 4). The cryptographic system comprises a computational apparatus that performs modular reduction (e.g. finite field engine 400) subsequent to running a routine for a plurality of word sized finite fields.

## GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL:

Claims 1 and 3-11 are pending in this application and do not stand allowed.

Claims 1 and 3-11 have been finally rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,230,179 to Dworkin et al. (hereinafter "Dworkin").

In the office action dated September 16, 2005, the Examiner rejected original claims 1-6 as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0136402 A1 to Vanstone. In the response filed on March 16, 2006, the Appellant amended claims 1, 4 and 6, canceled claim 2, and added new claims 7-11. Claims 1, 4 and 6 were amended to recite and/or emphasize that upon completion of the computation performed on the machine words, a modular reduction is performed to reduce the result to a predetermined number of words.

The above-noted amendments appear to have overcome the rejection in view of the Vanstone reference, however, the Examiner then finally rejected claims 1 and 3-11 as being anticipated by Dworkin. In the final office action, the Examiner stated that: "Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Accordingly, this action is made final." [emphasis removed]

In the new grounds of rejection, the Examiner contends that Dworkin teaches each and every element recited in claims 1 and 3-11, including: "upon completion of said computation, performing modular reduction to reduce said result to a predetermined number of words." The

Examiner cites column 4, lines 29-34 and column 10, lines 43-53 as teaching such a feature.

A response after final rejection was filed on August 28, 2006 arguing that Dworkin does not in fact teach such a feature and cannot anticipate. An advisory action was issued on September 14, 2006 indicating that the arguments were not persuasive. As such, claims 1 and 3-11 stand rejected.

The Appellant maintains their previous arguments regarding Dworkin, in particular that Dworkin does not teach reducing the result after the computation, and does not operate on machine words. The Appellant therefore respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

## **ARGUMENT:**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3-11 under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Dworkin. The Appellant respectfully traverses the rejections as follows.

# A. Supplemental Discussion Regarding Claimed Subject Matter

The Appellant has provided a detailed summary of the claimed subject matter in section VI above. To supplement the above summary, the Appellant wishes to further discuss one particular feature recited in, e.g. claim 1, where upon completion of the computation, a modular reduction is performed to reduce the result to a predetermined number of words. As discussed in the specification of the present application on page 23, lines 6-10, the predetermined number of words may be thought of as an indication of, e.g., "how many machine words are needed to store finite field elements". This is exemplified in terms of a finite field multiplication in the specification of the present application at page 16, line 24 through page 17, line 20. In particular, at page 16, line 29 through page 17, line 2, it is emphasized that: "...the multiplication operation is composed of wordsized multiplications. Again the finite field multiplication is composed on wordsized non-reducing multiplications, coupled with a specific reduction engine preferably tailored to the specific finite field." [emphasis added] It is clear therefore that reduction does not take place during the multiplications (i.e. full reduction) but rather a specific reduction takes place at the end.

For ease in understanding this concept, and as would be understood in the cryptographic arts, reducing to a predetermined number of words can be considered as reducing the result to a

"word boundary" to accommodate the sizes of various field elements.

As discussed on page 12, lines 17-26 of the specification as originally filed, the reduction is performed after the routine (or computation) so that the finite field elements may be consistently stored in registers of the same word length, which, as discussed above, can save effort in the computation and add randomness.

Moreover, reducing the result overcomes having to use routines that deal with different exact word sizes or using general purpose code built to handle any number of word components, which is typically slower (see page 3, lines 5-23). Performing bit shifts for each bit of the multiplier results in longer processing time and extra processor operations (see page 4, lines 13-15).

The Applicant has recognized that a predetermined number of words can be chosen to accommodate, e.g. a NIST standard polynomial (e.g. see page 23 as discussed above). When considering word sized values, leading zero coefficients may be added to the full word size and, rather than reducing fully, in the claimed invention, two values may, e.g., be multiplied and then reduced, but only to a particular word size. In this way, the effort required for full reduction need not be expended and only a specific reduction to a predetermined number of words is needed.

For example, before the value is used, and perhaps following many calculations in the "not-fully reduced" form, a final reduction can be made at the end, so as to have a unique value as is required, e.g. by standards to employ in elliptic curve cryptography.

To further assist in the understanding of the above concepts, the Appellant refers to the Evidence Appendix, wherein a detailed example of how the claimed invention operates in comparison to Dworkin is provided. The evidence has been prepared by Robert J. Lambert.

In summary, the Appellant has recognized that by reducing the result of the routine when performing word sized operations, rather than reducing fully as was done prior, the above efficiencies can be achieved and the above drawbacks can be avoided.

## **B.** What Dworkin Teaches

Dworkin teaches a finite field multiplier with intrinsic modular reduction. The multiplier operates using, e.g. a pair of operand registers 42 and 44, and an arithmetic logic unit (ALU) 4. Operation of the ALU is described in column 4, lines 14-51. It should be noted that the

Examiner has relied on portions of this passage in rejecting claims 1, 3, 4 and 6.

The above-noted passage illustrates operation of the ALU for performing finite field multiplication. Two elements a and b, which are bit vectors (e.g. b=b0,...,bn-1) are multiplied to obtain a product C. It can be appreciated that a bit vector is a single series of bits of arbitrary length, which represents an element. When performing the multiplication, partial products of the multiplicand and each of the bits  $b_i$  of the multiplier are formed. It can be appreciated by those skilled in the fields of mathematics and cryptography, that in this context, partial products can be considered pre-accumulated elements (each being reduced), which are then combined to form product C.

As such, in Dworkin, reduction is performed at each step and thus <u>full</u> reduction is performed during the entire operation, which is in fact what is avoided in the present application on appeal. In Dworkin, the <u>partial products</u> are reduced by the modulus if the most significant bit of the previous partial product is set (i.e. if it is a 1) – see column 4, lines 32-34. The balance of the above-noted passage describes <u>repeated</u> use of the modulus register and shifting of the bits. The Appellant, as previously argued, believes that it is clear from this passage that Dworkin teaches reducing the partial products, thus performing full reduction, and does not teach reducing the result to a predetermined number of words as claimed by the Appellant.

The Appellant notes that the passage in column 10, lines 43-53, also relied upon by the Examiner, also clearly teaches reducing the <u>partial products</u> and not the result of the routine.

#### C. Appellant's Submission regarding Dworkin

In order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), each and every element recited in the claims must be found in the cited reference. The Appellant respectfully submits that Dworkin fails to recite each and every element claimed, in particular performing modular reduction subsequent to computing the result and performing word sized operations. As such, Dworkin cannot anticipate.

As noted above, the claims of the present appeal require that the result of the computation/routine/intermediate be reduced to a predetermined number of words rather than by performing full reduction (i.e. reducing at each step as was previously done), to ensure consistent word sizes. Dworkin simply has not recognized the benefits of reducing to a predetermined number of words and is in fact entirely silent as to word sized operations. Moreover, it is

believed to have been shown that Dworkin clearly teaches reducing at each partial product (i.e. at each step of the routine), which is in fact what is avoided by reducing the result at the end, as claimed.

The Examiner further argues in the Advisory Action that column 10, lines 45-52 teaches reducing the result. This is clearly a misinterpretation as this passage again teaches reducing each <u>partial product</u> – i.e. full reduction.

The Appellant notes that the previous rejections in view of the Vanstone reference were argued on a similar point, namely that the Vanstone reference also teaches reducing partial products and does not perform word sized operations. As such, the Appellant believes that the Dworkin reference is no more relevant than the previously cited Vanstone reference, which appears to have been successfully argued over.

It is therefore believed to have been shown that Dworkin clearly does not teach every element recited in claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 (and those dependent thereon). As such, Dworkin cannot anticipate and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is believed to be improper.

The Appellant also notes that, as discussed in detail above, the claims under appeal deal with <u>word sized operations</u>, and reduce the result of the computation to a predetermined number of words. The word sized method claimed in the present application under appeal separates the full reduction out so that reduction is only needed to be applied when desired (e.g. to supply unique representations for ECC algorithms). However, Dworkin only mentions operating on bit vectors and even explicitly teaches reducing at each step, thus performing full reduction. As discussed above, the Appellant again respectfully submits that Dworkin is entirely silent regarding word sized operations and clearly teaches only full reduction at each step.

The Appellant believes that the Examiner is incorrect in interpreting the teachings in Dworkin as word sized operations (see Advisory Action). Operating on word size values rather than bit vectors is not arbitrary, and these terms cannot be considered interchangeable as the Examiner seems to believe. It is improper to reject a claim as being anticipated on the basis of an extrapolation of the teachings of the cited reference, even more so where the Examiner has not pointed to any passage in the teachings that would support such an extrapolation. Dworkin simply does not teach word sized operations and the Examiner has failed to specifically support the basis for this interpretation. Each and every claim in the present application deals with word sized values and, for at least this reason, Dworkin cannot anticipate.

Accordingly, it is believed that Dworkin fails to teach yet another feature recited in the claims under appeal. For this additional reason, Dworkin cannot anticipate.

## D. Summary

It is therefore submitted that, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Dworkin clearly does not teach reducing the result of the finite field operation and, moreover does not teach word sized operations. Dworkin thus fails to teach each and every element claimed, and, as such cannot anticipate.

## **CONCLUSION:**

In view of the foregoing, the Appellant believes that the Examiner has misconstrued the passages relied upon in rejecting the claims under appeal as being anticipated by Dworkin. In particular, Dworkin clearly does not teach modular reduction upon completion of the accumulation, but rather teaches reducing partial products prior to accumulation. Dworkin also does not perform word sized operations as claimed but is only concerned with bit vectors. Therefore, Dworkin clearly does not teach every element claimed and, as such, cannot anticipate.

The Appellant respectfully requests that this honourable Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the Examiner's decision in this case and indicate the allowability of claims 1 and 3-11 in this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Agent for Applicant

Registration No. 58,772

BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP

Suite 2800, P.O. Box 25

199 Bay Street, Commerce Court West

Toronto, Ontario M5L 1A9

CANADA

BSL/

Date: May 9/07

Tel: 416.863.2518

Appl. No. 10/058,212 Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006

## **CLAIMS APPENDIX:**

Listing of the claims involved in the appeal:

- 1. (previously presented) A method of adding elements of a finite field  $F_{2^m}$ , where m is less than a predetermined number n, said method comprising the steps of:
- a) storing a first and a second element in a pair of registers, each of said pair of registers comprising said predetermined number of machine words;
  - b) establishing an accumulator having said predetermined number of machine words; and
- c) computing for each of said machine words in said accumulator the exclusive-or of the corresponding machine words representing each of said first and second elements to obtain a representation of a result of the addition of said elements, and, upon completion of said computation, performing a modular reduction to reduce said result to a predetermined number of words.

## 2. (canceled)

- 3. (original) A finite field multiplier operable to multiply two elements of one of a plurality of finite fields, said finite fields being partitioned into subsets, said multiplier comprising:
- a) a plurality of wordsized finite field multipliers, each suitable for multiplying elements of each finite field in a respective subset of said plurality of finite fields;
  - b) a finite field reducer configured to perform reduction in said one finite field;
  - c) a processor configured to
    - i) operate the wordsized finite field multiplier suitable for use with said one finite field to obtain an intermediate product; and
    - ii) operate said finite field reducer on said intermediate product to obtain the product of the two elements.
- 4. (previously presented) A method of performing a finite field operation on at least one element r, of a finite field, comprising the steps of:
  - a) representing each element as a number of machine words;

- b) performing a wordsized operation on said representations, said wordsized operation corresponding to said finite field operation;
  - c) completing said wordsized operation for each word of said representations to obtain a result; and
- d) performing a modular reduction of said result to reduce said result to a predetermined number of words.
- 5. (original) A finite field engine for performing a finite field operation on at least one element of a finite field chosen from a set of finite fields, said set of finite fields being divided into subsets according to their word size, comprising:
  - a) a finite field operator for each of said subsets;
  - b) a finite field reducer for each of said finite fields;
- c) a processor configured to choose the finite field operator corresponding to the subset containing said chosen finite field and the finite field reducer for said chosen finite field and apply the chosen finite field operator to said element to produce an intermediate result and apply the chosen finite field reducer to said intermediate result to obtain the result of said finite field operation.
- 6. (previously presented) A cryptographic system comprising:
  - a) a plurality of elliptic curves, each specifying elliptic curve parameters and a respective finite field;
  - b) a plurality of finite field settings corresponding to each finite field;
  - c) a plurality of wordsized finite fields, each having routines, each finite field being assigned to one of said wordsized finite fields;
  - d) a reduction routine for each finite field;
  - e) a computational apparatus configured to perform a cryptographic operation by the steps of:
    - i) selecting one of said elliptic curves; and
    - ii) performing a cryptographic function using the routines from the wordsized finite field to which the respective finite field corresponding to said selected elliptic curve is assigned; said routines including at least one finite field

operation and, subsequent thereto, a modular reduction to obtain a result of said operation corresponding to a predetermined number of words.

- 7. (previously presented) A method according to claim 4 wherein said modular reduction is determined by said finite field.
- 8. (previously presented) A method according to claim 4 wherein said finite field operation is addition.
- 9. (previously presented) A method according to claim 4 wherein said finite field operation is subtraction.
- 10. (previously presented) A method according to claim 4 wherein said finite field operation is multiplication.
- 11. (previously presented) A method according to claim 4 wherein said finite field operation is division.

## **EVIDENCE APPENDIX:**

# Example prepared by Robert J. Lambert:

The following f is the irreducible polynomial used in the NIST standard sect163k1 curve:

$$f := x^163+x^7+x^6+x^3+1$$
.

The improvement is to not to reduce fully, but rather only to reduce to a word boundary.

When 32-bit words are used, the next word boundary is at 192 bits. We would then reduce with this shifted polynomial:

fw:= sort(expand( $x^29*f$ ));

$$fw := x + x + x + x + x$$

It can be awkward to write out these polynomial (mod 2) values, so instead they will be presented as binary numbers. We will use the convention in this writing that a higher order coefficient is written to the left of lower order coefficients, that is, written high to low from left to right. This notation is, of course, arbitrary.

Here are the irreducible and the shifted irreducible written in this way:#

convert(polynomialToInteger(f), binary);

convert(polynomialToInteger(fw), binary);

When we are considering wordsized values, we will, when convenient, write out the leading 0 coefficients to the full wordsize. For example, the unshifted modulus here is written out to the full 192 bits using leading zeros:

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
print(polynomialToBinary(f, fw));
00000000000000000000000000011001001
Here are several random values, which are only reduced enough to fit in the 192-bit word aligned
limit:
a := randomPolynomial(fw):
b := randomPolynomial(fw):
c := randomPolynomial(fw):
polynomialToBinary(a,fw);
101011010011100011101001111101001101
polynomialToBinary(b,fw);
1000001011011100101011111011000111000
polynomialToBinary(c,fw);
1111010011100100000110110101111100100
We can multiply these values, mod 2, without reducing fully, yielding:
abw := multiplyPolynomial(a,b):
convert(polynomialToInteger(abw), binary);
```

We still reduce, but only to the wordsize that we are employing, and therefore we don't need to

expend the effort of full reduction. There are multiple 192-bit strings which reduce (mod f) to the same value.

The utility of not reducing fully is, in part, to save the effort, and to randomize the representation, since there are now many ways to write the value, when not completely reduced.

Here is the wordsized reduced value as described in the patent application:

There are many ways to arrive at this, for example by wordsized reduction interleaved with multiplication, or by full multiplication without reduction followed by wordsized reduction (which is what we have just performed). In general, any method using only wordsized reduction, not the complete reduction of the older is covered.

Before we use the value, and perhaps after many calculations in the not fully reduced form, we can at the end make a final and full reduction, so as to have a unique value as is required by standards to employ in elliptic curve cryptography. For example, we might add another value:

Here is the complete reduction of the multiplication and addition just given (with leading zeros):

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
abcwr := reducePolynomial(abcwr, f):
polynomialToBinary(abcwr,fw);
100011000000110100101110011001010001
This is now contrasted with the Dworkin reference:
The Dworkin reference would have used the fully reduced representation for the values a and b.
The fully reduced representations are given by:
ar := reducePolynomial(a, f):
br := reducePolynomial(b, f):
cr := reducePolynomial(c, f):
polynomialToBinary(ar,f);
0101110
polynomialToBinary(br,f);
1000000
polynomialToBinary(cr,f);
1010010
When multiplying, the partial products are fully reduced at each step in Dworkin. The partial
products of the multiplication of Dworkin are printed completely below (prefixed with the index
and comma, and counting down, as was done in the outer loop of the Dworkin teachings):
```

162, 1000000 161, 0000000 160, 1000000 159, 1001001 158, 0010010 157, 

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
0100100
156,
0001000
155,
1010000
154,
1100000
153,
1000000
152,
1001001
151,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
1011011
150,
1110110
149,
0100101
148,
0000011
147,
1001111
146,
0010111
145,
```

```
1101110
144,
1010101
143.
0100011
142,
0001111
141,
0010111
140,
1100111
```

```
139,
0000111
138,
0001110
137,
0011100
136,
0110001
135,
0101011
134,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
1010110
133,
0100101
132.
0000011
131,
0001111
130,
0011110
129,
1111100
128,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
1111000
127,
0111001
126,
1110010
125,
0101101
124,
0010011
123,
```

1100110

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
122,
0001100
121,
1010001
120,
1100010
119,
1000100
118,
0000001
117,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
1000010
116,
1001101
115,
1010011
114,
1101111
113,
0010111
112,
0100111
111,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
0001110
110,
1010101
109,
0101010
108,
1010100
107,
1100001
106,
1001011
105,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
0011111
104.
0111110
103.
1110101
102,
1100011
101,
\
0001111
100,
0010111
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
99.
1101110
98.
1011100
97,
0110001
96.
0101011
95,
1011111
94,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
1111110
93.
1110101
92,
1100011
91.
1001111
90,
1011110
89,
1110101
88,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
\
0101010
87,
0011101
86,
1111010
85,
0111101
84,
0110011
83,
1100110
82,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
1000101
81,
1001010
80,
0010100
79,
0101000
78,
0010000
77,
1101001
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
76,
0010010
75,
0101101
74,
0010011
73,
1100110
72,
0001100
71,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
0011000
70,
1110000
69,
0101001
68,
0011011
67,
0111111
66,
0110111
65,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
0101110
64,
0011100
63,
1111000
62,
1111001
61,
0111011
60,
0111111
59,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
0111110
58,
0111100
57,
1110001
56,
1101011
55,
0010110
54,
0100101
```

```
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
53,
0001010
52,
0011101
51,
0111010
50,
0110100
49,
1100001
48,
```

Appl. No. 10/058,212

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
1001011
47.
1010110
46,
1101100
45,
1011000
44,
1111001
43,
1110010
42,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
\
0100100
41.
1001000
40,
1010000
39,
0101001
38,
1011011
37,
0110110
36,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
1101100
35,
0010001
34,
0100010
33,
1001101
32,
1011010
31,
```

0111101

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
30.
1110011
29,
1101111
28,
0011110
27,
1111100
26,
1110001
25,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
1100010
24,
0001101
23,
1011010
22,
0110100
21,
0101000
20,
1010000
19,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
0101001
18,
0011011
17,
1111111
16,
0111110
15,
0110101
14,
0100011
13,
```

```
Appl. No. 10/058,212
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
1000110
12,
0000101
11,
1001010
10,
0011101
9,
0111010
8,
0111101
```

```
Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006
7,
1111010
6,
1110100
5,
0101000
4,
0011001
3,
0111011
2,
```

Appl. No. 10/058,212

Appl. No. 10/058,212 Appeal to the Final Rejection dated: May 26, 2006 0110110 1, 1100101 0, 0000011 As can be seen in the last iteration of the loop the result of this complete reduction multiplication is: polynomialToBinary(ab, f); 0000011 At this point, to mirror the calculation which we performed

without complete reduction, we can add the completely reduced value c:

```
abc := addPolynomial(ab, cr):
```

Here we see that the final mathematical value of the two methods are the same, modulo the irreducible, although the wordsize method separated the full reduction out so that is need only be applied when desired (for example to supply the unique representation used in an ECC algorithm). Many other operations (such as additions, squarings and inversions) might also be performed without full reduction; only the final result need be reduced to comply with standard elliptic curve methods such as signatures or key agreements. The final reduced values are the same. After final reduction there is zero difference between the results:

```
(abcwr - abc) mod 2;
```

0

## RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

## NONE

21599720.2